

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending herein. In the Office Action, claims 1, 10, and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Su (US Patent 5,212,808), claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Su in view of Wachs (US Patent 3,813,497), claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Su in view of Wachs and Crosby (US Patent 4,597,487), claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Su in view of Wachs and Rogers (US Patent 4,878,215), and claims 7-9 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Su in view of Rogers.

Claims 2 and 3 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were otherwise considered allowable.

In the specification, paragraphs 20 and 21 had typographical errors which are corrected herein. In paragraph 20, original reference to “201b” in FIG. 2 is incorrect and is replaced with “205” as originally intended. In paragraph 21, the original listing of the switches “S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7 and S7” is incorrect in which the last occurrence of “S7” is replaced with “S8” as originally intended. Applicant requests approval of these amendments.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 10, and 16-20 based on Su.

Su does not show “a plurality of multiplexers, each receiving a plurality of address signals” as recited in claim 1. In FIG. 1 of Su, the interface and multiplexer 18 is shown as a single block, with additional details shown in FIG. 6 of Su. In FIG. 6, the

PSTM/ISDM signals are provided as inputs to a single multiplexer 180 of the interface and multiplexer 18. In this manner, only a single multiplexer is shown rather than a plurality of multiplexers as claimed. Su also does not show “a switch matrix having a first interface coupled to said plurality of multiplexed signals” as recited in claim 1 in which each of the plurality of multiplexed signals is provided from one of the plurality of multiplexers.

In a similar manner, claim 10 is allowable over Su since Su does not show “a plurality of multiplexers, each having a plurality of data signal lines coupled to said first interface” as recited in claim 10. Su further does not show “a switch matrix, having a multiplexed interface coupled to said multiplexed signal lines” in which the multiplexed signal lines are from the plurality of multiplexers as recited in claim 10.

Wachs does not overcome the deficiencies of Su, so that claims 4 and 11 are allowable over Su in view of Wachs.

Crosby does not overcome the deficiencies of Su in view of Wachs, so that claims 5 and 12 are allowable over Su in view of Wachs and Crosby.

Rogers also does not overcome the deficiencies of Su in view of Wachs, so that claim 6 is allowable over Su in view of Wachs and Rogers.

Likewise, Rogers does not overcome the deficiencies of Su, so that claims 7-9 and 13-15 are allowable over Su in view of Rogers.

Nonetheless, to expedite allowance of the present application, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the substance of claim 2 and claim 2 is canceled. Claim 3 is amended to depend upon claim 1 rather than canceled claim 1. Since claim 2 was otherwise

considered allowable, claim 1 is now allowable according to that stated in the Office Action. Claims 4-9 are allowable as depending upon allowable claim 1. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 4-9.

In a similar manner, as claims 1 and 10 have similar features, the substance of claim 2 is also incorporated into claim 10 so that claim 10 is allowable. Claims 11-15 are allowable as depending upon allowable claim 1. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11-15.

Claims 16-20 are allowable over Su for similar reasons as claims 1 and 10 among many other reasons. Su does not show “distributing a plurality of first analog signals among a plurality of multiplexers” as recited in claim 16 as Su only shows one multiplexer. Su also does not show “selecting a configuration for the plurality of multiplexers” or “addressing the plurality of multiplexers according to the selected configuration” as further recited in claim 16 since Su only shows one multiplexer and has nothing to do with configuration of multiple multiplexers. Su also does not show “coupling selected ones of a plurality of multiplexed signals from the plurality of multiplexers according to the selected configuration to a plurality of second analog data signals” as recited in claim 16.

In this manner, claim 16 is allowable over Su and claims 17-20 are allowable as depending upon an allowable base claim. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Further with respect to claims 17-20, Su does not show “combining the plurality of multiplexers into groups” as recited in claim 17 since Su shows one multiplexer and provides no showing whatsoever of grouping multiplexers.

Further with respect to claims 18-20, Su does not show “routing a common set of address signals to each multiplexer of a group of multiplexers” as recited in claim 18 since Su shows one multiplexer and provides no showing whatsoever of routing address signals to each of a group of multiplexers.

Further with respect to claims 19-20, Su does not show “selecting a multiplexed signal of a multiplexer of a group of multiplexers” as recited in claim 19 since Su shows one multiplexer and provides no showing whatsoever of selecting a multiplexed signal of one of a group of multiplexers.

None of the amendments made herein, if any, were related to the statutory requirements of patentability, but instead were made for purposes of clarity and/or to remove extraneous and/or unnecessary language. Also, none of the amendments were made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons recited above and for various other reasons, the objections and rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits therefore that the present application is in a condition for allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Should this response be considered inadequate or non-responsive for any reason, or should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions that would expedite the prosecution of the present case to allowance, Applicants' undersigned representative earnestly requests a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2007

By: /Gary Stanford/  
Gary R. Stanford  
Reg. No. 35,689

Gary R. Stanford  
Law Office of Gary R Stanford  
Customer Number 26122